ATTACHMENT A — FY2020 SCORING SHEET (To guide review team discussion) Project Name: Project Sponsor: Reviewed By:

Scoring Instructions: Score on a scale of 0 to 3. "0" indicates the application does not address the question, and 1, 2 and 3 correspond to Low, Medium and High, respectively (3 = High). **Items in** <u>italics</u> will be filled in by DEQ staff.

Part A – General Information

	Score		Weight		Points
Sufficient technical and managerial resources are available to facilitate completion of the project, including consideration of past performance.		Χ	4	=	
Sponsor worked with DEQ staff during development of application. Sponsor provided a complete and timely application.		Χ	2	П	
PART A - TOTAL			ΊAL		

Part B1 - Project Information

PROJECT NAME					
General Information	Score		Weight		Points
Project costs are reasonable as compared to anticipated results.		Х	4	=	
Nonpoint source goals for the project are clearly defined, measurable, and attainable.		Х	4	11	
Landowner commitment is clearly evident.		Х	2	=	
Project involves appropriate partners and has significant stakeholder support.		Х	3	=	
Planning and Coordination	Score		Weight		Points
Pre-project planning is sufficient to ensure project will move forward if funded.		Х	4	=	
Implementation	Score		Weight		Points
The project is an appropriate next step for making progress towards removing a pollutant/waterbody combination from Montana's 2018 Impaired Waters list.		х	5	=	
The project will lead to long-term, sustainable reductions in nonpoint source pollution.		Х	4	=	
The project will promote self-maintaining natural, ecological, and social processes that will protect water quality.		Х	4	=	
Effectiveness Evaluation	Score		Weight		Points
Project includes appropriate metrics for evaluating project effectiveness.		Х	2	=	
Bigger Picture	Score		Weight		Points
The project provides benefit to additional natural resources (e.g., native fisheries, endangered species, wetlands, etc.).		Х	1	=	
The project addresses climate change.		Х	1	=	
The project location provides direct public recreational or aesthetic benefit.		Х	1	=	

	PAF	RT B1 – TO	TAL	
impaired.	^	1	_	
The project will help prevent healthy waterbodies from becoming	х	1	_	
The project directly helps protect a drinking water source.	Χ	1	=	
source in a manner that could contribute to future economic benefit for a downstream Montana community.	Х	1	=	
The project reduces pollutant loading above a permitted point				

Part B2 – Project Information

PROJECT NAME					_
Cost/Benefit	Score		Weight		Points
Nonpoint source goals for the project are clearly defined, measurable, and attainable.		Х	4	=	
Project costs are reasonable as compared to anticipated results.		Χ	4	=	
Planning and Coordination	Score		Weight		Points
Pre-project planning is sufficient to ensure project will move forward if funded.		х	4	=	
Project involves appropriate partners and has significant stakeholder support.		Х	3	=	
Landowner commitment is clearly evident.		Χ	2	=	
Implementation	Score		Weight		Points
The project is an appropriate next step for making progress towards removing a pollutant/waterbody combination from Montana's 2018 Impaired Waters list.		х	5	=	
The project will promote self-maintaining natural, ecological, and social processes that will protect water quality.		Х	4	=	
The project will lead to long-term, sustainable reductions in nonpoint source pollution.		х	4	=	
Effectiveness Evaluation	Score		Weight		Points
Project includes appropriate metrics for evaluating project effectiveness.		Х	2	=	
Bigger Picture	Score		Weight		Points
The project provides additional benefit to natural resources (e.g., native fisheries, endangered species, wetland protection, etc.).		Х	1	=	
The project addresses climate change resiliency and adaptation.		Х	1	=	
The project location provides direct public recreational or aesthetic benefit.		х	1	=	
The project reduces pollutant loading above a permitted point source in a manner that could contribute to future economic benefit for a downstream Montana community.		х	1	=	
The project directly helps protect a drinking water source.		Х	1	=	
The project will help prevent healthy waterbodies from becoming impaired.		Х	1	=	
		PAF	RT B2 – TO1	AL	

Part B3 – Project Information

PROJECT NAME					_
Cost/Benefit	Score		Weight		Points
Nonpoint source goals for the project are clearly defined, measurable, and attainable.		Х	4	=	
Project costs are reasonable as compared to anticipated results.		Х	4	=	
Planning and Coordination	Score		Weight		Points
Pre-project planning is sufficient to ensure project will move forward if funded.		Х	4	=	
Project involves appropriate partners and has significant stakeholder support.		Х	3	=	
Landowner commitment is clearly evident.		Х	2	=	
Implementation	Score		Weight		Points
The project is an appropriate next step for making progress towards removing a pollutant/waterbody combination from Montana's 2018 Impaired Waters list.		Х	5	=	
The project will promote self-maintaining natural, ecological, and social processes that will protect water quality.		Х	4	=	
The project will lead to long-term, sustainable reductions in nonpoint source pollution.		Х	4	=	
Effectiveness Evaluation	Score		Weight		Points
Project includes appropriate metrics for evaluating project effectiveness.		Х	2	=	
Bigger Picture	Score		Weight		Points
The project provides additional benefit to natural resources (e.g., native fisheries, endangered species, wetland protection, etc.).		х	1	=	
The project addresses climate change.		Х	1	=	
The project location provides direct public recreational or aesthetic benefit.		Х	1	=	
The project reduces pollutant loading above a permitted point source in a manner that could contribute to future economic benefit for a downstream Montana community.		х	1	=	
The project directly helps protect a drinking water source.		Х	1	=	
The project will help prevent healthy waterbodies from becoming impaired.		Х	1	=	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		PAF	RT B3 – TO	ΓAL	

Part C – Education and Outreach

	Score		Weight		Points
Education and outreach task will promote or facilitate future efforts to reduce nonpoint source pollution.		Х	3		
Education and outreach plan targets the most appropriate audience(s) with an appropriate delivery method.		Х	3		
PART C - TOTAL			ΓAL		

Score Summary and Funding Recommendations	
Part A Total	
Project B1 Total	
Project B2 Total	
Project B3 Total	
Sum of Project Scores	
Number of Projects	
Average Project Score	
(Sum of Project Scores, divided by Number of Projects)	
Part C Total	
GRAND TOTAL	Т
(Part A Total + Average Project Score +Part C Total)	
FUNDING DECOMMENDATION	
FUNDING RECOMMENDATION FF = Fully Fund, PF+ = Partial Fund (>50%), PF— = Partial fund (<50%), NF = Not Fund	
	1
Reviewer Comments Please provide detailed, specific comments. DEQ staff will take these comments into consideration wl final funding recommendations to EPA. Also, DEQ may also share your comments, in whole or in part, sponsors and the public. Thanks again, for giving of your time and knowledge to help restore and prot waters from the harmful effects of nonpoint source pollution! General Comments:	with project

Tasks and Budget Recommendations:
Additional Information Required from Sponsor: